DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 551 HE 016 472

AUTHOR Floyd, Carol Everly
TITLE Balancing State and Institutional Perspectives in the Implementation of Effective State-Level Academic Program Review. ASHE 1983 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 25-26, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; College Planning; *College Programs; *Decision Making; Educational Assessment; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; State Boards of Education; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Program Discontinuance

ABSTRACT

Academic program review is analyzed in regard to purposes, process, schedule and timing, criteria, and decisions. Attention is also briefly addressed to the organizational entities that oversee the process of state-level program review. The purposes of program review are linked to budgeting decisions, mission delineation, and potential program improvement. In terms of process, statewide boards can share responsibility for review with public universities, or the boards may assume major responsibility for academic program review through a consultant-based approach or through the use of agency staff. Most states have applied a number of criteria in program review rather than a few--particularly, the number of graduates, students enrolled, student interest and demand, appropriateness to role and mission, program quality, size of classes, and cost of courses--but consensus is lacking as to how qualitative factors should be used in program review. State-level recommendations resulting from program review may include continuation, modification, merger, or discontinuation. Additional considerations relating to state-level program review include: whether to review degree programs or departments, research and public service centers, and nonacademic areas; the accommodation between program review and specialized accreditation; the pattern of use of program review in other state-level decision making; expectations of other state-level authorities; and the nature of institutional leadership exercised. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232551

BALANCING STATE AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EFFECTIVE STATE-LEVEL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Carol Everly Floyd

Illinois Board of Regents

HE 016 472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Everly Floyd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for delivery at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 25-26, 1983

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C. March 25-26, 1983. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

BALANCING STATE AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EFFECTIVE STATE-LEVEL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

State-level program review of existing public university degree programs has been implemented by the statewide board in most states. Typically, there has been considerable divergence of institutional and state perspective on program review issues. Also, the overall picture of how program review fits into and impacts upon institutional and state-level policy is not yet clear.

This analysis of the literature on program review was motivated by a convergence of the author's academic and practitioner interests. The author's comprehensive literature search on state-level policy completed during parts of 1981 and 1982 resulted in a monograph on statewide planning, budgeting and accountability approaches. The author noted that a sizable literature on program review had developed rather rapidly. Trained primarily as a political scientist, she was therefore particularly interested in examining the patterns of conflict and consensus in state and institutional perspectives on program review issues and the nature of the resolution that developed out of the give and take between the parties. This interest is reinforced by her role as the assistant academic officer of a multi-university system in a state which has developed a shared approach to program review involving institutions, system governing boards, and a statewide coordinating board.

This paper analyzes issues about program review in the following categories: purposes, process, schedule and timing, criteria, and decisions. This analysis will lay special emphasis upon identifying both divergent perspectives and compromises which have been developed or are developing in at least some states. Analysis will also be provided of possible broadening of state-level program review within the public sector and the extension of that review to the private sector. Finally, the more generic literatures on accountability approaches and on rational decision-making will be used to identify some broader questions about the impact and significance of program review.

Some brief background about the organizational entities which oversee the process of state-level program review and about the nature of program review needs to be provided before a more detailed framework for analysis can be constructed.

BACKGROUND

The statewide board has been the primary state-level authority involved in review of university programs as legislatures and governors and their staffs have turned their attention in other directions. The terms "statewide board", "state board," and "state agency", are used generically to include any board commission, department, council or other agency that has authority over all public universities in a state and whose functions minimally include planning. The three major areas in which most statewide boards have some responsibility that is either prescribed by law or developed as policy are: planning, program approval and budget development. Currently most statewide boards

are either consolidated governing boards for all public universities in a state or coordinating boards which have substantial regulatory authority. Statewide governing boards are vested with authority and responsibility for all decisions and resources of any given university. A coordinating board performs a number of statewide functions but does not replace and assume the duties of governing boards (Millard 1976).

As used in this paper, program review is an assessment of the need for and/or effectiveness of an existing program. State-level program review denotes a formal process carried out by a board with statewide responsibility. Such state-level review is conducted in accord with established procedures and may or may not include an active institutional role (adapted from Folger 1977a). Accountability to state-level authority for effective accomplishment of the state's higher education purposes is the broadly construed purpose for program review (Green 1981; Barak and Berdahl 1978).

Although in 1970 only a handful of states were involved in the review of existing programs, by 1980 approximately 80% of statewide boards were involved in review and/or recommendation with regard to the status of existing programs. Most of the involved boards also have some formal authority to enforce program discontinuance or are politically in a strong position to exert pressure on institutions toward that end (Barak 1982; pp. 52-3; Melchiori 1980, p. 170).

Certainly, campus administrative officers increasingly accept state-level program review of existing programs as a fact of life and as a helpful tool in dealing with certain entrenched campus interests (Barak and Berdahl 1978). Institutions continue, however, to strongly assert the need for peer review in any qualitative judgments made in the program review process (Sloan Commission 1980; Carnegie Foundation 1982).

PURPOSES

Both universities and statewide boards typically see program review as an extremely important administrative function for the 1980's and 1990's. The insights about programmatic strengths and weaknesses are crucial to making priority decisions at both the campus and state levels for the maintenance and improvement of higher education services during a period of financial stringency. A very high priority is attached to further developing major areas of strength, improving programs which are important to meeting local, state, and national needs but which have yet to reach their potential, and phasing out relatively low priority activity. These concerns suggest continuing attention to linking program review and budgeting, relating program review to scope and mission delineation, and providing incentives to engage in renewal and improvement activities (Folger 1980b).

Wallhaus describes a range of purposes and objectives for program review and classifies them along a continuum according to the extent to which they are related to state-level or institutional responsibilities (Table 1 follows on next page). The table helps identify areas of overlap and potential conflict. Wallhaus gives the greatest attention to three areas of special state interest: statewide educational policies and plans, statewide program mix, and educational and economic justification. He concludes that the greatest potential for conflict between institutions and statewide boards exists when the primary

Table 1. Purposes and Objectives of Program Review

	Tends to be more closely tied to state-level responsibilities ←			*Tends to be more closely tied to institutional responsibilities* →
A. Determination of statewide educational policies, long-range plans, and programmatic priorities (that is, support development of statewide master plans)	X			
B. Elimination of unnecessary program duplication, or, conversely, identification of needs for new programs		X		
C. Determination of educational and economic priorities in terms of: consistency with role and mission			X	
need for improvement or expansion and additional resources necessary to accomplish (linkage to budget decisions)			X	
decisions to decrease or terminate (linkage to resource reallocation decisions)			X	
D. Determination of relationship to established standards of quality, or preparation for entry into professions, and so on (linkage to accreditation, continuation of operating authority or licensing authority)			X	
E. Improving communications with constituents; assuring information provided to students and prospective students, parents, alumni, governmental agencies, and others is consistent with actual practice			X	
F. Determination of quality controls and policies (for example, admission policy, graduation requirements)				X
G. Determination of curricular modifications, advisement procedures, institutional plans and priorities relative to instructional, research, and service objectives				X
H. Personnel and organizational decisions—faculty promotion and tenure, academic leadership, organizational structures, and philosophies				X

Source: Wallhaus 1982, p. 77.

orientation of the state-level review is the determination of educational and economic justification because of the considerable overlap of responsibility for such determination between the statewide board, the campus and also sub-units within the campus (Wallhaus 1982).

The best potential for the minimization of conflict would seem to lie in a sorting out which involves each administrative level concentrating on review foci which can most distinctively be developed at that level. Groves identifies the way in which that sorting out has tended to move in Illinois, a state whose higher education structure is based on multi-campus governing boards and a statewide coordinating board and where the level of conflict over state-level program review has been relatively low. Campus level reviews are carried out for the purpose of maintaining the quality and currency of programs and facilitating the development of new program alternatives within the limits of the university's existing resource base. Although the foci of the program reviews undertaken by the governing boards and the statewide coordinating board are less precisely defined, there is a trend toward the governing board exercising primary responsibility in a control sense--looking at the desirability of deleting or significantly modifying programs in order to facilitate the strengthening of other programs or the development of requested new programs. Groves sees the statewide coordinating board in Illinois, while by no means renouncing an interest in the economic and educational justification of programs, putting a primary emphasis on the broader statewide planning issues and the efficient utilization of higher education's total resources (1979).

There is certainly no consensus even among the various statewide boards as to how much emphasis should be placed in statewide review on identifying low priority programs for recommended elimination. Mingle believes that statewide board recommendations for program elimination should be used sparingly even in conditions of retrenchment, with the board continuing to concentrate on the most obvious examples of duplication, low productivity, and incongruence with university scope and mission. In Mingle's judgment, the state board should concentrate on providing the right political environment and incentives for campuses to do their own review aimed at reallocation and retrenchment. He recommends this because he believes state mandated program discontinuance is not going to produce substantial costs savings and because institutions are in the best position to identify specific programs and personnel to be cut. Institutions must be cautioned, however, that if they do not do their own careful evaluation and priority setting, legislative and gubernatorial intervention through budget bills is likely (Mingle 1981).

PROCESS

Institutional concerns about the nature of the review process vary, of course, according to the nature of the state-level review process which is employed in a particular state. Barak offers a categorization of state-level processes which provides a useful framework for analysis. First, statewide boards can share responsibilities for review with public university campuses (and sometimes multi-campus system offices). Second, the statewide board may assume major responsibility for reviewing existing academic programs either through the use of a consultant-based approach or almost exclusively through the use of agency staff (Barak 1982).

Shared Responsibilities. In a shared responsibilities arrangement, the institution is largely responsible for the review. A statewide board might adopt this approach either for lack of authority for a different approach or because it believed that campuses were in the best position to make their own tough decisions (Barak 1982). The campus level reviews may then be reviewed by an interinstitutional committee, or, in summary, by the staff of the statewide board. In Wisconsin, the statewide system administration limits its role to monitoring institutional reviews to assure their quality (Smith 1980).

As a complement to institutional review of programs, the state agency may provide special or lateral review of disciplines or clusters of disciplines across all institutions. The emphasis in these reviews will typically be statewide policies and plans as well as programmatic mix rather than the retention or elimination of particular institutional programs.

In a process where the campus is largely responsible for the review, the campus bears a particularly strong responsibility for assuring the external credibility of its review process. In order to assure such credibility, care must be taken to build in the checks and balances necessary to assure that both necessary expertise and lack of self-interest are brought to bear (Wallhaus 1982). In the Wisconsin approach mentioned above, the system administration does find it necessary to intervene in some instances where particularly narrow self-interests have come into play (Smith 1980).

In states where the structure of higher education includes both multi-campus university systems and a statewide coordinating board, responsibilities for program review may be shared three ways. It is important that the system office and the state agency office have a workable arrangement for integrating their analysis in program review and related areas in order to generally reinforce other administrative understandings, maximize external credibility, and minimize campus administrative workloads (Groves 1979; Bowen and Glenny 1981; Barak 1982). (An apparently workable pattern which emerged in Illinois during the late 1970's is described under PURPOSES above.)

The degree and meaningfulness of institutional involvement in any review process (whether involving shared responsibilities or being primarily agency directed) is a critical factor in the credibility of the process (Barak and Berdahl 1978). Wilson categorizes the ways that states include institutions as reactive, advisory, or formative. The three strategies are seen as points along an access to decision-making continuum with reactive strategies at one end and formative strategies at the other (Wilson 1980). Barak adds that, from an institutional perspective, formative participation is especially attractive because it theoretically allows an opportunity for involvement in all of the review stages. As with other aspects of the review process, the specific role will be determined by a number of factors including historical patterns, statutory authority, politics, and personalities (Barak 1982).

Consultant-Based. Some state higher education agencies, including those in Louisiana and New York, have found consultant review attractive because such review is perceived as the most objective approach given the deep reliance in the academic community upon peer evaluation for qualitative judgments. Such a process ordinarily begins with institutional self-studies of

the programs to be reviewed which provide information on aspects such as curriculum, faculty, library, and other supporting resources. Outside peer consultants are then selected to provide qualitative evaluations based on the self-studies and site visits. These evaluations may or may not be made public and statewide board staff may or may not feel bound by these evaluations in making their own recommendations. It should be noted that an initial balancing of state and institutional interests must be accomplished in the commissioning of the consultant(s) so the consultant is viewed as neither being the "hired gun" of the state agency nor providing an "inside job" for the program faculty. Understandings can, however, usually be worked out which involve one party, usually the statewide board, commissioning the consultant with the advice and consent of the other party (Wallhaus 1982).

Difficulties may arise from the use of faculty who have outstanding national reputations (and who are normally chosen from outside the state to avoid conflicts of interest) as consultants for statewide program review. In the most fundamental terms, a review process undertaken to assure accountability to the state may end up assuring accountability primarily to national peers and the discipline (Mingle 1978). Mingle and Barak and Berdahl note a number of difficulties, from both the institutional and state perspectives, which may arise out of the accountability that consultants perceive they have to the discipline as represented by the most outstanding doctoral programs and faculty within the discipline. Such consultants generally lack a close knowledge of interinstitutional relationships and the general statewide context. Due to their focus on narrowly defined traditional measures, they will find it difficult to assess graduate programs which provide access to part-time clienteles and which are not heavily research-oriented. In review of doctoral programs, regional campuses may feel that consultants are biased against them and that consultants do not believe that quality education can be conducted at institutions which do not have long histories of doctoral education and which may at one time had the status of teachers colleges (Barak and Berdahl 1978; Mingle 1978).

On the whole, great care must be given to the choice of consultants. Barak provides sound advice for their selection and involvement in the process (1982). Given the pattern of difficulties outlined above, it is particularly important that a.) consultants be chosen with specific circumstances and needs in mind, b.) consultants be provided full information about institutional relationships and the general statewide context, and c.) that state agency staffs retain the option to make their own recommendations which may disagree with those of the consultants.

Agency Staff Review. A few states conduct review placing responsibility almost entirely with the state board staff instead of consultants. States using this approach typically rely heavily on data from the state agency information system as well as information which the campus is asked to generate specifically for the review. On the basis of a survey of program review and discontinuation procedures nationwide, Melchiori concluded that a process which is conducted entirely by statewide agency staff is unlikely to be accepted or successful because of problems of institutional resentment which tend to grow rather than to diminish and negative publicity which seems to impact all agency operations (1980). Additional analysis relating to

institutional discomfort with the heavily quantitative analysis frequently employed as a part of this approach is provided under CRITERIA below.

SCHEDULE AND TIMING

Wallhaus identifies five alternatives which the statewide board can us to schedule program reviews, each of which has different advantages and disadvantages from the university and state-level perspectives. Table 2 on the next page shows advantages and disadvantages of scheduling on the following bases: cyclical, other external requirements, key indicators, crisis, and policy or planning rationale. Some states have employed combinations of these alternatives in order to meet a variety of needs (Wallhaus 1982).

Considerable friction over scheduling can arise in a process which involves responsibilities shared by institutions and the statewide board. Although the institutions are in a position to schedule their individual program reviews and will ordinarily do so on a cyclical basis which is also meshed with various specialized accreditation calendars, the statewide board is still free to conduct its own statewide lateral reviews based on a policy or planning rationale. The statewide lateral review may be disruptive of the institutional schedule unless the statewide board stipulates that the campus can provide analysis based on the most recent cyclical review. In any case, intensive and time-consuming statewide lateral reviews will inevitably draw campus attentions and energies away from the cyclical reviews.

CRITERIA

A great deal of the research on review of existing programs has focused on criteria against which existing programs are to be reviewed. Particularly notable surveys of criteria are Barak and Berdahl (1978) and Melchiori (1980). Green (1981) provides an especially interesting analysis of patterns in the various states.

Most states have applied a number of criteria in the review of existing programs rather than a few. A task force of the Education Commission of the States suggested 10 criteria related to need, quality, and productivity which should be taken into account in statewide program review, especially when retention or elimination was at issue (1973). A survey reported by Barak and Berdahl indicates that each of these is used by some states although no one state uses all. The most frequently used, in order, are number of graduates, students enrolled, student interest and demand, appropriateness to role and mission, program quality, and size of classes and costs of courses (Barak and Berdahl 1978). Based on his analysis of the criteria used for program review in those states where that activity has been most visible, Green concludes that state-level review processes have been more sensitive than have those of other internal university bodies or external bodies to using multi-dimensional measures of program quality (1981).

Due to both institutional sensitivities and methodological difficulties, consensus is lacking as to how the statewide board should handle the qualitative factors involved in program review. A number of state boards deal with the problem by explicitly stating that state-level reviews will not

Table 2. Alternatives for Scheduling Program Reviews

	Advantages	*Disadvantages*
A. All programs reviewed on a cyclical basis (for example, once every five years)	Assures all programs are periodically examined Easier to organize and manage; allows units to systematically prepare for reviews; Smooths workload at campus and state levels	Potential for redundant or wasted effort (that is, the process is carried out whether it is warranted or not)
B. Schedules meshed with external requirements (for example, accreditation reviews)	Eliminates redundancy, which is inevitable if this is not done	Internal purposes may be driven by external requirements and hence not realized to fullest possible extent
C. Selection based on key indicators (for example, enrollment or resource trends)	Serves to focus review efforts in areas where program modifications may be necessary	Raises concerns relative to the unreliability of the indicators, which may not be sufficiently sensitive or applicable to avoid triggering "unwarranted" reviews Does not ensure that all programs will be examined even over long periods of time Usually carries negative connotations; indicators point to problems
D. Crisis selection (for example, reviews based on student complaints or concerns raised by state agency or other institutions relative to unnecessary program duplication)	Focus of program review is on problem areas and needed modifications	Reviews driven largely by negative factors, most of which may be external to program Crisis management, the problem may be too large to address positively if uncovered too late
E. Selection based on policy or planning rationale related to certain categories of programs (by instructional level or by discipline, for example)	Facilitates comparative analyses, particularly from a state perspective Serves to more clearly delineate purposes of review	Driven largely by needs external to institutions (purpose more closely aligned with state-level interest—see Table 1). Institutional purposes may be submerged or institutional scheduling disrupted

Source: Wallhaus 1982, p. 81.

directly focus on quality and that qualitative review is the responsibility of the institution (Barak and Berdahl 1978). Other states rely heavily on the use of outside consultants, a practice whose advantages and drawbacks have been discussed above. Hines differentiates between two types of program quality in order to suggest complementary program review roles for institutions and the state agency. The institution and its faculty should make judgments about the intrinsic value (merit) of a program, while the state agency assesses the worth of the program in relation to existing and anticipated statewide circumstances (Hines 1981).

Generally, statewide boards are reluctant to use primarily quantitative measures of quality but board staffs in a few states are convinced that quantity and quality are closely related. The State of Washington, in particular, has used a number of quantitative measures of program quality in the program review process and has made a major effort to illustrate how much of the quality of programs can be demonstrated quantitatively. A number of indicators of quality which can be quantitatively assessed are identified and examples given of how institutions and national professional associations use similar approaches to assign qualitative rankings (Chance 1980; Engdahl and Barak 1980).

Institutions will not in most instances have to deal with state boards which apply qualitative criteria with unwarranted stringency. In this regard, Green suggests that the states will avoid getting too much into qualitative aspects because finding too many deficiencies might suggest a qualitative improvement initiative with attendant implications for additional funding or for reduced access. In most instances, he suggests, states will allow institutions to review qualitative aspects and to seek whatever qualitative improvement is possible within the limits of existing institutional resources (Green 1981).

There are continuing disagreements between statewide boards and institutions about the extent to which labor market demand and projections should be a major factor in the review of existing programs. Although state agency personnel tend to place considerably more emphasis on job market factors than do institutions, the level of conflict has been limited in two ways. First, as noted by Mingle, state agency personnel have generally recognized the importance of other outcomes of education and broader definitions of need. The states therefore have ordinarily not attempted to apply labor market criteria to review of existing programs in the arts and sciences (Mingle 1978). Second, for those professional programs where there should be a closer correspondence between a particular degree and certain occupational roles, many states have focused more on how well graduates have been prepared for labor market roles rather than whether there is an "oversupply" or "shortage" of graduates. This focus is not dissimilar to campus-level review perspectives.

DECISIONS

State-level recommendations made as a result of program review may include continuation, modification, merger, or discontinuation. Variations and further fine-tuning of the recommendations can be done to best adapt to institutional circumstances (Melchiori 1980). Unfortunately, information on

the range of state-level recommendations is limited due to the almost total emphasis in the literature on the relationship between program review and program discontinuance.

In order to assess the significance of state-initiated program discontinuations for campuses, one needs to have some measure of the nature of the programs which have been eliminated. Melchiori provided a useful framework for that examination by identifying four levels of program termination: (1) the elimination of "paper programs" which involve few students and few, if any, faculty on a full-time basis, (2) the elimination of programs with no adverse consequences for students or tenured faculty, (3) the elimination of programs with serious consequences for tenured faculty and students, and (4) the elimination of entire units, departments, or colleges (1980).

The mix of programs terminated as a result of state-level program review tends to change in most states as program review processes have become more established and financial stringencies have become more pronounced. In one study, Barak concluded that most terminations to the date of the survey fit in the first of Melchiori's categories. He noted that was about what you would expect for the first rounds of program review when the state board is proceeding with extreme caution, particularly strong respect for institutional independence, and desire to avoid challenges to its program review role (Barak 1981). After a subsequent survey, Barak reported a shift from Level One to Level Two actions, with 61% of the terminations at Level Two but only 8% at Level Three and 1% at Level Four (1982).

Although statewide boards have sometimes identified program review as a useful tool in retrenchment in public institutions, state mandated program discontinuance, did not frequently in the mid and late 1970's, result in cost savings (Skubal 1979; Mingle 1981; Barak 1981). It cannot be assumed, moreover, that recent shifts in the character and magnitude of programs terminated will necessarily mean that there will be institutional cost savings. Substantial cost savings can result only from removing the faculty and staff involved in the terminated program from the university payroll. If the faculty connected with the program are tenured, most institutions have tended to continue institutional commitment by offering a faculty role in other programs. In any case, cost savings will not be immediate as institutions will usually follow the norm of providing a year's notice (or salary in lieu thereof) unless the discontinuation is concurrent with the declaration of a financial exigency.

Given this pattern of institutional cost savings, Callan advises that state boards be careful not to build unreasonable expectations about the nature of results from the program review process. Boards should sell program review to the legislature and state budget offices as a way to assure vitality and responsiveness and to help institutions in living with less money through internal tradeoffs, not as a way to refund money to the state treasury (Callan 1980).

Melchiori suggests that implementation of a program discontinuance support system will increase the prospects for positive impacts of program terminations from both a state and institutional perspective. This approach requires the identification of incentives for, obstacles to, coping mechanisms for,

and rewards for more institutionally initiated discontinuations and for the best cooperation with state recommendations (Melchiori 1980, 1981, and 1982).

In order to increase their ability to provide a program discontinuance support system, state boards need to monitor more closely possible negative impacts of terminating programs (Melchiori 1980 and 1981). The major difficulties in gaining information about impacts are: limited and restricted communications resulting from institutional and political sensitivities; the discontinuation outcome is not emphasized by the state agency to ease relations with the campuses; neither the state agency nor the institution want to become involved in fine-tuning; the state agency desires private communications with both campuses and state political branches in order to allow varied emphases (Melchiori 1982). Melchiori identifies a number of areas of impact of terminations that state agencies need to know more about before they can develop adequate support systems. Among the areas she identifies are: enrollment in related programs at the institution and neighboring institutions, impact on state human resource needs, pre and post-discontinuation budgets in related areas, faculty turnover patterns, and faculty research productivity. Assessments in these areas can take place in a small-scale incremental fashion (Melchiori 1980).

Melchiori goes on to identify a number of coping mechanisms for state agencies which have a positive effect on the change process. Among the state approaches she identifies are: cultivate a reduction ideology, provide reduction rewards and incentives, avoid confrontations and alienating major power blocs, and provide money for faculty retraining both to ease the impact of program closure and to help in the reformulation of some declining programs (Melchiori 1981).

Recent statements which point in the direction of the emergence of a reduction ideology in higher education more generally emphasize strong assertions that higher education's main priority must be protecting quality and that requires prioritizing rather than across-the-board cuts. One visible reflection of the development of such an ideology is the statement in December 1982 by the National Commission on Higher Education issues that identifies across-the-board cuts as posing the single greatest threat to higher education during the next ten years.

Perhaps the strongest incentive that universities have to initiate program discontinuances or to act expeditiously on state-level recommendations is the credibility and accountability which is thereby demonstrated. As previously noted, Mingle's argument for reliance upon institutions to make the primary discontinuance initiatives also includes the judgment that legislatures will act to eliminate programs through riders on budget bills if universities themselves do not take the bull by the horns (Mingle 1981). Statewide boards typically look upon review of existing programs as an excellent mechanism to both demonstrate accountability to the legislature and help campus leaders to deflect some of the "heat" for difficult but warranted decisions (Callan and Jonsen 1980).

Statewide boards have encountered difficulties in developing financial incentives for institutions to concentrate resources in high priority areas while eliminating low priority activity. Very little funding is distributed in

most states outside the state formula or outside an incremental budgeting approach. Although some states target monies specifically for innovative activities (through project grants) or for qualitative improvement, only Oklahoma has an approach which provides some clear incentives for deleting old programs in favor of new ones. The Oklahoma Board of Regents ties program planning and fiscal budgeting together in such a way that no new program is approved without money first being earmarked in the budget for its implementation. No new program is initiated until existing programs have been funded at the one hundred percent level (Barak 1982).

BROADENING IN PUBLIC SECTOR

The remaining issues about the scope and focus of state-level program review for public universities relate to a) specification of the instructional program to be reviewed (degree program or department?), b) the addition of research and public service centers, and c) the addition of non-academic activities. Each of these areas raises some specific problems from an institutional perspective.

Instructional Program. Wallhaus notes that state boards prefer to focus program review on degree programs because state authority is usually defined in terms of degree programs and because societal concerns and occupational opportunities are most closely aligned with degree programs. By contrast, many public universities feel that institutional objectives related to program review are best met by a discipline or organizational unit perspective which recognizes the difficulties of separating program characteristics by degree program and which reinforces the university's authority structure. The usual compromise between state and institutional perspectives is to review concurrently all programs within a given discipline while recognizing that not all characteristics will be broken out fully at every degree level (Wallhaus 1982).

Research and Public Service Centers. It is difficult to develop a shared institutional and state approach to the review of research and public service activity because very different issues are raised at the two levels. Most state-level studies relate to research and public service have therefore not built on institutional levels of research but rather have been viewed as an effort to address a particular state-level policy issue (Wallhaus 1982).

Non-Academic Areas. The same accountability concerns that lead states to undertake the review of existing degree programs and other programmatic activity may lead to additional focused review activity in non-academic areas as well because substantial portions of the budget are allocated to these areas. However, the key issues for administrative and support functions center on operational efficiencies and it is very difficult to identify an appropriate state-level role in this context (Wallhaus 1982).

EXTENSION TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Although private universities participate on a voluntary basis in state-level review conducted by a statewide coordinating board in only a few states, coordinating boards are increasingly likely to seek private university involvement in program review in order that private universities also demonstrate

their accountability to the state. This increased demand for effective performance will arise out of both the public function served by the non-public sector and its increased governmental support both direct and indirect (Jonsen 1980).

State-level review of existing programs of private universities is consistent with the emphasis that a number of states have placed upon fully integrating consideration of both the public and private sectors in meeting the total higher education needs of the state. The credibility of any state-level review processes that impact upon both the public and private sector is dependent upon the establishment of procedures that provide reciprocal opportunities to participate and reciprocal obligations to be bound by the results (Wilson and Miller 1980). Statewide coordinating boards are in a better position than statewide governing boards to undertake planning and program review which includes the private sector because they are less likely to be regarded as too closely aligned with public university interests (Barak and Berdahl 1978; Wilson 1980).

Jonsen notes that little consensus exists at this time as to the meaning of accountability for the private sector and the extent and means of participation of the private sector in state-level planning and program review. Understandings will need to be worked out in a manner that is sensitive to and balances the needs of both the states and private institutions (Jonsen 1980). Some current private sector attitudes suggest that such an accommodation may be a number of years in the future. For example, the executive officers of associations of private institutions in many states continue to prefer non-involvement in state planning activity as the best strategy due to doubts about effectiveness and judgments that their real opportunities for influence lie with the governor and the legislature (Odell and Thelin 1981).

IMPACT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STATE-LEVEL PROGRAM REVIEW

The impact and significance of the process of program review by the statewide board are related to the nature of the accommodation between program review and specialized accreditation, to the pattern of use of program review insights in other state-level decision-making processes, to the expectations of other state-level authorities, and to the nature of institutional leadership exercised.

Accommodation between Program Review and Specialized Accreditation. The impact of program review will depend upon the relative emphasis which institutions and state-level boards place upon program review versus specialized accreditation as a means of assuring programmatic vitality and strength. Shared processes of program review place emphasis on leadership of the institutional vice-president for academic affairs (provost) and reinforce his/her attempts to effectively integrate the programmatic activities of the university. By contrast, specialized accreditation places emphasis upon the leadership of the dean or department chair and encourages colleges/departments to take the specialized accrediting body as the primary reference point with the university viewed as little more than a loose confederation.

Putting program review on a strong footing in large universities which include a number of professional programs will necessitate some dimunition of the role

that specialized accreditation has played in the life of these universities. There are now indications that universities and state-level boards will more fully articulate their discomforts with the increasing specification by these accrediting bodies of curriculum and resource requirements and are ready to take concerted action to win acceptance on limits for that role. One reflection of this discomfort is the recent Carnegie Foundation report which identifies the dangers that specialized accreditation poses for the internal political life of the university and basic institutional prerogatives (1982). The Foundation has also endorsed the concept of regional accrediting bodies performing a coordinative role relative to the work of the specialized bodies in order to promote a greater institution-wide perspective underlying the activities of the specialized accrediting bodies ("Excerpt from Carnegie Fund's Report on Academic Governance" 1982; Kells 1980).

Pattern of Use of Insights Derived. A significant portion of the impact of program review upon higher education institutions and statewide boards will depend upon the extent to which insights on programmatic strength and weakness which result from program review can be factored into budgetary decisions. Considerable progress has been noted in making use (informally and, to some extent, formally) of insights derived from program review in the budgetary process at the campus level (Barak 1982). It is unlikely that links between program review and budgeting will be formalized at the state-level because of difficulties of both a conceptual and political character which have been noted in earlier attempts to formally link planning and budgeting processes. Analyses of these earlier efforts include Education Commission of the States (1980) and Floyd (1982).

It may well be that the connection between program review and budgeting needs to be similar to that between planning and budgeting. In the latter case, Purves and Glenny suggest that connection needs to be less "formal and routine" but still "conscious and deliberate" so that the routines of the budgetary process will not drive out the more complex and deliberative character of programmatically oriented processes (Purves and Glenny, 1976, p. 171). Features of program review which make it difficult to factor some of the results of program review into the budgetary process are: review on multi-year cycle rather than all simultaneously, number and complexity of variables utilized, and lack of bottom-line orientation.

Expectations of Other State-Level Authorities. The emphasis that state boards place on review of existing programs will also depend on the extent to which statewide boards perceive state political leaders as well disposed to accept statewide program review as a major element in university demonstration of accountability to state government.

Program review is one of a variety of accountability approaches which have been developed for assessing the results and effectiveness of higher education operations. Accountability approaches have been categorized by Floyd on the basis of the focus of the approach--degree program, institution-wide activities and statewide board functions. Although the statewide board is the primary state-level authority involved in the review of degree programs, legislative and/or gubernatorial staffs are more frequently involved in approaches which focus at one or both of the other two levels. Approaches

which focus on the broader institutional level include performance budgets, performance audits, condition of education reports, and state processes linked to regional accreditation. Review focusing on the statewide board involves examination of the extent to which the board facilitated the operations and goal attainment of the whole set of institutions to which the board's authority extends. Floyd concluded that, as of 1982, program review was the most widely accepted and successful state-level accountability approach (Floyd 1982).

The further development and refinement of program review and other accountability approaches will, however, be handicapped by the absence of a stable set of expectations between state government and higher education institutions. In this regard, Folger notes that policy approaches change in some states with each new gubernatorial administration and that in a few states the structure and powers of the statewide board are also frequently altered. Folger goes on to identify a variety of programmatically related concerns of political leaders which do not relate to specific degree programs. Statewide boards will need to carefully consider, in close consultation with institutions, whether they want to incorporate additional aspects into program review or would prefer to develop themselves or see other state-level authorities develop additional review processes (Folger 1980a and 1980b).

Opportunities for Institutional Initiative. A positive institutional stance increases the probability of campus influence on the specifics of program review and other accountability measures and of winning state-level understanding of their limitations. Folger (1977b) and Millard (1977) advise institutions who are critical of review criteria proposed by state-level authorities to suggest refinements or possible alternatives to minimize the likelihood of less helpful answers being provided by others. Adamany warns institutions that they should work to develop better measures to assess the quality and effectiveness of their activities rather than assert that appropriate measures do not exist. Such assertions are not credible when they come from institutions which cast themselves as social critics and whose faculties are heavily involved in developing evaluation methods for other kinds of organizations (Adamany 1979).

Once universities have responded to state-level accountability demands in a positive fashion, Hines and Wiles suggest that universities have an important opportunity to negate the illusion that accountability can or should be complete. Exhaustive knowledge of extremely complex and constantly changing phenomena is simply not possible. Universities must therefore work hard "to legitimate the necessary fuzziness of their organizational life" (Hines and Wiles 1980, p. 306).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamany, David. "Government, Quality Programs and Effective Resource Use in Higher Education." Paper presented at Annual Academic Planning Conference, University of Southern California, June 1979. ED 176 690.

Barak, Robert J. "Program Evaluation as a Tool for Retrenchment." In Challenges of Retrenchment, edited by James R. Mingle, pp. 212-225. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

----------. Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without. Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982.

Barak, Robert J., and Berdahl, Robert O. State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education, Report No. 107. Denver: Education Commission of the States, February 1978. ED 158 638.

Bowen, Frank M. and Glenny, Lyman A. Quality and Accountability: An Evaluation of Statewide Program Review Procedures. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, April 1981. ED 200 156.

Callan, Patrick. "The Challenge to Program Reviewers." In Post-secondary Education Program Review, pp. 25-32. Boulder, Colo: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1980. ED 184 486.

Callan, Patrick M., and Jonsen, Richard W. "Trends in Statewide Planning and Coordination." Educational Record 61 (Summer 1980): 50-53.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982.

Education Commission of the States. Coordination or Chaos: Report of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Post-secondary Education, Report No. 143. Denver: Education Commission of the States, October 1973. ED 093 239.

----------. Challenge: Coordination and Governance in the '80s, Report No. 134. Denver: Education Commission of the States, July 1980. ED 194 019.

"Excerpt from Carnegie Fund's Report on Academic Governance," Chronicle of Higher Education, 13 October 1982, pp. 10, 12, and 13.

Floyd, Carol Everly. State Planning, Budgeting, and Accountability: Approaches for Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Folger, John K. "Editor's Notes." In Increasing the Public Accountability of Higher Education, edited by John K. Folger, pp. vii-xii. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 16. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977a.

----------. "Suggestions for the Future." In Increasing the Public Accountability of Higher Education, edited by John K. Folger, pp. 91-94. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 16. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977b.

----------. "Implications of State Government Changes." In Improving Academic Management, edited by Paul Jedamus and Marvin W. Peterson, pp. 48-64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980a.

----------. "Workshop Overview." In Postsecondary Education Program Review, pp. 3-10. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1980b. ED 184 486.

Green, Kenneth C. "Program Review and the State Responsibility for Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 52 (January/February 1981): 67-80.

Groves, Roderick T. "Program Review in a Multi-Level State Governance System: The Case of Illinois." Planning for Higher Education 8 (Fall 1979): 1-9.

Hines, Edward R. "Assessing Quality and Excellence in Higher Education: The Mutually Complementary Roles of Campus and State." Paper presented at Annual Meeting, North East Association for Institutional Research, October-November 1980.

Hines, Edward R., and Wiles, David K. "Commentary: The Pendulum Dynamics of Accountability in Higher Education." College and University 55 (Spring 1980): 302-308.

Jonsen, Richard W. State Policy Issues Affecting Independent Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, April 1980. ED 190 013.

Kells, H.R., "Proliferation and Agency Effectiveness in Accreditation: An Institutional Bill of Rights." In American Association for Higher Education, Current Issues in Higher Education, 1980 No. 2, pp. 19-26.

Melchiori, Gerlinda S. "Pattern of Program Discontinuance: A Comparative Analysis of State Agency Procedures for Initiating and Implementing the Discontinuance of Academic Programs." Research Report. Ann Arbor: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, 1980.

----------. "Coping with Curricular Change in Academe." AIR (Association for Institutional Research) Professional File, No. 11. Inserted in AIR Newsletter, Spring 1981.

----------. Planning for Program Discontinuance: From Default to Design. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Millard, Richard M. State Boards of Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1976. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976. ED 129 196.

----------. "Reconciling Statewide Priorities and Institutional Aspirations." Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education, Dearborn, Michigan, November 1977. Education Commission of the States Inservice Education Program--State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. ED 202 317.

Mingle, James R. "Influencing Academic Outcomes: The Power and Impact of Statewide Program Review." In The Closing System of Academic Employment, pp. 51-68. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978. ED 160 032.

----------. "Choices Facing Higher Education in the 1980s," In Challenges of Retrenchment, edited by James R. Mingle, pp. 335-353. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

National Commission on Higher Education Issues. To Strengthen Quality in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: 1982.

Odell, Morgan and Thelin, John. "Bringing the Private Sector into Statewide Higher Education Planning." Policy Studies Journal 10 (Autumn 1981): 59-70.

Skubal, Jacqueline M. "State-Level Review of Existing Academic Programs Have Resources Been Saved?" Research in Higher Education 11-3 (1979): 223-232.

Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education. A Program for Renewed Partnership. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1980.

Smith, Donald K. "Multi-Campus System Approaches to Academic Program Evaluation." In Academic Program Evaluation, edited by Eugene C. Craven, pp. 43-67. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Wallhaus, Robert A. "Process Issues in State-Level Program Reviews." In Designing Academic Program Reviews, edited by Richard F. Wilson, pp. 75-87. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Wilson, Richard F. "Institutional Participation and Reciprocity in State-Level Program Reviews." Journal of Higher Education 51 (November/December 1980): 601-615.

Wilson, Richard F., and Miller, James L., Jr. Private College Participation in Planning and Program Review Activities of Forty-Five State-Level Higher Education Agencies. Ann Arbor: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, June 1980. ED 195 209.